



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,829	01/15/2004	Andrew A. Kostrzewski	2003-01	7135
1054	7590	07/13/2007	EXAMINER	
LEONARD TACHNER, A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION 17961 SKY PARK CIRCLE, SUITE 38-E IRVINE, CA 92614			HO, TUAN V	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2622				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/13/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/758,829	KOSTRZEWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan V. Ho	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2-8 and 10-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 2-8 and 10-15 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 16-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2622

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/10/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to claims 16-22, Applicants argue that claimed invention includes vertex-based transformation in high speed processing unit unwrapping software; however, claims 16-22 do not recite the features. It should be noted that claimed "graphic processing unit program" in claim 16 is met by Quicktime VR or QuarkX-press (col. 9, lines 15-50).

For the above reason, the rejections of claims 16-22 are repeated.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 16-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Driscoll, Jr. et al (US 6,459,451).

With regard to claims 16 and 17, Driscoll, Jr. Discloses in Figs. 2A, i0 and 13A, the panoramic video system having real-

Art Unit: 2622

time distortion-free imaging; the system comprising the panoramic optical system having at least one optical element for viewing a 360° field of view and focusing a corresponding image on an image plane (the panoramic camera system as shown in Fig. 2A provides a real-time images in rectangular format as shown in Fig. 10, col. 4, lines 2-27 and col. 8, lines 46-53; video camera having a sensing element at said image plane for converting said image into a corresponding video signal; a computer receiving said video signal and having at least one graphics processing unit program for configuring a substantially distortion-free rectangular display of said image at a rate of at least 30 fps; and a monitor for presenting said display, Fig. 2A, CCD 250, cols. 4, lines 1-65, col. 9, lines 35-50; computer system displays images at a rate of 30 fps and computer display).

With regard to claim 18, Driscoll, Jr. Discloses in Figs. 2A, i0 and 13A, the panoramic video system having real-time distortion-free imaging; the system comprising the video camera comprises a CCD sensing element (CCD array, col. 4, lines 64-65).

With regard to claim 22, Driscoll, Jr. et al discloses the same at least one graphics card for configuring said rectangular display (Figs. 3A and 3B and col. 8, lines 15-42).

Art Unit: 2622

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e, (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll et al.

With regard to 19, Driscoll et al discloses closes the same subject matter as discussed with respect to claim 16, except for the CMOS image plane.

Official Notice is taken for a CMOS image sensor which is old and well known in the art; where the CMOS image sensor has advantages such as using less power than a CCD image sensor. Therefore, Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the CCD image sensor of Driscoll et al with a CMOS image sensor in order to save battery power and easily to manufacture.

With regard to claims 20 and 21, Driscoll et al does not discloses any video camera sensing element has a pixel resolution of at least 1280 x 1024 and video camera sensing element has a pixel resolution of at least 720 x 480. However, Official Notice is taken for video resolutions of 1280 x1024 and 720 x 480 are well known to be used in HDTV and EDTV. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the pixel resolution of Driscoll et al with the well known video resolutions of 1280 x1024 and 720 x 480 since the pixel resolution of 1280 x1024 and

Art Unit: 2622

720 x 480 would allow a user to display images on HDTV or EDTV signals.

4. Claims 2-8, 10-15 are allowed.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TUAN HO whose telephone number is (571) 272-7365. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 7AM to 4PM.

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.



TUAN HO

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2622